



JON M. HUNTSMAN, JR.
Governor

GARY R. HERBERT
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MICHAEL R. STYLER
Executive Director

Division of Oil, Gas and Mining

JOHN R. BAZA
Division Director

February 10, 2010

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT
7005 2570 0000 4801 5686

Mark Dotson
Western Utah Copper
1208 South 200 West
P.O. Box 492
Milford, Utah 84751

Subject: Proposed Assessment for State Notice of Violation No. MN-2010-25-1, Western Utah Copper Company, WUCC Copper Mine, M/001/0067, Beaver County, Utah

Response Due By: 30 Days of Receipt (March 15, 2010)

Dear Mr. Dotson:

The undersigned has been appointed by the Division of Oil, Gas & Mining as the Assessment Officer for assessing penalties under R647-7.

Enclosed is the proposed civil penalty assessment for the above referenced notice of violation. The NOV was issued by Division Inspector, Tom Munson on January 21, 2010. Rule R647-7-103 et. seq. has been utilized to determine the proposed penalty of \$3,410. The enclosed worksheet outlines how the civil penalty was assessed. By these rules, any written information which was submitted by you or your agent within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this NOV has been considered in determining the facts surrounding the violation and the amount of this penalty.

Under R647-7-106, there are two informal appeal options available to you. You may appeal the 'Fact of the Violation', the proposed civil penalty, or both. If you wish to informally appeal you should file a written request for an Informal Conference within thirty 30 days of receipt of this letter.

The informal conference will be conducted by a Division-appointed Conference Officer. The informal conference for the fact of the violation is distinct from the informal assessment conference regarding the proposed penalty.



Page 2
Mark Dotson
Western Utah Copper
M/001/0067
February 10, 2010

If you wish to review both the fact of the violation and proposed penalty assessment, the assessment conference will be scheduled immediately following the review of the fact of the violation.

Western Utah Copper Company

If a timely request for review is not made, the fact of the violation will stand, the proposed penalty will become final, and will be due and payable within thirty (30) days of the date of this proposed assessment (by March 15, 2010). Please remit payment to the Division, mail c/o Vicki Bailey.

Sincerely,



Lynn Kunzler
Assessment Officer

LK:vs

Enclosure: Proposed assessment worksheet

cc: Vicki Bailey, Accounting
Vickie Southwick, Exec. Sec.

O:\M001-Beaver\M0010067-WUCC\non-compliance\MN-2010-25-01\ProAssess-3355-02102010.doc

WORKSHEET FOR ASSESSMENT OF PENALTIES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS & MINING
Minerals Regulatory Program

COMPANY / MINE Western Utah Copper Company PERMIT M/001/0067
NOV # MN-2010-25-01

ASSESSMENT DATE February 10, 2010

ASSESSMENT OFFICER Lynn Kunzler

I. HISTORY (Max. 25 pts.) (R647-7-103.2.11)

- A. Are there previous violations, which are not pending or vacated, which fall three (3) years of today's date?

PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	EFFECTIVE DATE	POINTS (1pt for NOV 5pts for CO)
<u>None</u>	<u></u>	<u>0</u>

TOTAL HISTORY POINTS 0

II. SERIOUSNESS (Max 45pts) (R647-7-103.2.12)

- NOTE: For assignment of points in Parts II and III, the following apply:
1. Based on facts supplied by the inspector, the Assessment Officer will determine within each category where the violation falls.
 2. Beginning at the mid-point of the category, the Assessment Officer will adjust the points up or down, utilizing the inspector's and operator's statements as guiding documents.

Is this an EVENT (A) or Administrative (B) violation? Event
(assign points according to A or B)

A. EVENT VIOLATION (Max 45 pts.)

1. What is the event which the violated standard was designed to prevent?
Mining disturbances outside the permitted area
2. What is the probability of the occurrence of the event which a violated standard was designed to prevent?

<u>PROBABILITY</u>	<u>RANGE</u>
None	0
Unlikely	1-9
Likely	10-19
Occurred	20

ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS 20

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

******* Information provided indicated that there was mining related activities outside the current permitted and bonded area. Therefore, the event has occurred, points were assigned accordingly.

3. What is the extent of actual or potential damage? RANGE 0-25
In assigning points, consider the duration and extent of said damage or impact, in terms of area and impact on the public or environment.

ASSIGN DAMAGE POINTS 15

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

******* Multiple areas were impacted with heavy equipment and mine tailings were deposited in unpermitted areas, thus contaminating the ground. Some facilities were constructed prior to permitting as well. Points were therefore assigned to the upper half of the range.

- B. ADMINISTRATIVE VIOLATIONS (Max 25pts)
Does not apply to this violation.

TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS 35

III. DEGREE OF FAULT (Max 30 pts.) (R647-7-103.2.13)

- A. Was this an inadvertent violation which was unavoidable by the exercise of reasonable care? IF SO--NO NEGLIGENCE; or, was this a failure of a permittee to prevent the occurrence of a violation due to indifference lack of diligence, or lack of reasonable care, the failure to abate any violation due to the same or was economic gain realized by the permittee? IF SO--GREATER DEGREE OF FAULT THAN NEGLIGENCE.

No Negligence	0
Negligence	1-15
Greater Degree of Fault	16-30

STATE DEGREE OF NEGLIGENCE Greater Degree of Fault

ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 16

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

******* The operator had been told of the need to include all disturbance in the permit, and while an attempt was made to provide some of the information, not all of required information had been provided. He had been informed in writing on November 24, 2008, December 10, 2008, and September 14, 2009 of the need to update the plan and reclamation surety.

IV. GOOD FAITH (Max 20 pts.) (R467-7-103.2.14)

Good Faith Points were not evaluated or awarded at this time since the violation has yet to be abated.

(Either A or B) (Does not apply to violations requiring no abatement measures)

- A. Did the operator have onsite, the resources necessary to achieve compliance of the violated standard within the permit area?

IF SO--EASY ABATEMENT

Easy Abatement Situation

- Immediate Compliance -11 to -20*
(Immediately following the issuance of the NOV)
- Rapid Compliance -1 to -10
(Permittee used diligence to abate the violation)
- Normal Compliance 0
(Operator complied within the abatement period required)
(Operator complied with condition and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

*Assign in upper or lower half of range depending on abatement occurring the 1st or 2nd half of abatement period.

- B. Did the permittee not have the resources at hand to achieve compliance, or does the situation require the submission of plans prior to physical activity to achieve compliance?

IF SO--DIFFICULT ABATEMENT

Difficult Abatement Situation

- Rapid Compliance -11 to -20*
(Permittee used diligence to abate the violation)
- Normal Compliance -1 to -10*
(Operator complied within the abatement period required)
- Extended Compliance 0
(Permittee took minimal actions for abatement to stay within the limits of the NOV or the violated standard of the plan submitted for abatement was incomplete)
(Permittee complied with conditions and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

EASY OR DIFFICULT ABATEMENT? _____

ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS 0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

V. **ASSESSMENT SUMMARY (R647-7-103.3)**

NOTICE OF VIOLATION #		<u>MN-2010-25-01</u>
I.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	<u>0</u>
II.	TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	<u>35</u>
III.	TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	<u>16</u>
IV.	TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	<u>0</u>
	TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	<u>51</u>
TOTAL ASSESSED FINE		<u>\$3,410</u>